

**UDC 159.9: 81`23**

**Шимко Віталій Артурович**

доктор психологічних наук, директор центру, Аналітичний Центр "Пространство",  
Одеса, Україна

e-mail: [shymkovitalii@gmail.com](mailto:shymkovitalii@gmail.com)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4937-6976>

**Бабаджанова Анжела Нуріївна**

кандидат психологічних наук, директор з персоналу групи компаній «Голден  
Тайл», Київ, Україна

e-mail: [babadjanova.a@gmail.com](mailto:babadjanova.a@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-6342>

**ДИСКУРС-АНАЛІЗ УЯВЛЕНЬ УКРАЇНЦІВ ЩОДО КАРАНТИНУ:  
КОРОТКА ДОПОВІДЬ**

*Анотація*

***Мета.** Дослідження спрямоване на з'ясування лінгвістичної семантики поняття карантин та особливостей його сприйняття українцями.*

***Методи.** Дискурсивний аналіз письмових визначень карантину, отриманих від 104 російськомовних етнічних українців (47,1% жінок; середній вік - 41,5). Виявлені дискурси класифіковано, кількісно визначено та оброблено за допомогою методу бінарної логістичної регресії.*

***Результати.** Карантин, пов'язаний із Covid-19, представлений у мовній свідомості російськомовних українців дискурсивним полем, яке включає щонайменше сім впізнаваних, семантично автономних та взаємопов'язаних*

дискурсів: "Обмеження контактів"; "Санітарія та гігієна"; "Ізоляція хворих"; "Поширення вірусу"; "Зміни способу життя"; "Формально-бюрократичне реагування"; "Збереження здоров'я". Згідно результатів дослідження, зазначені дискурси перебувають в специфічній взаємодії один з одним, а також з деякими недискурсивного факторами, що загалом утворює дискурсивну формацію поняття карантин.

**Висновки.** Встановлено, що актуалізація одних дискурсів супроводжується дезактивацією інших, що робить сприйняття карантину одностороннім та упередженим. Отримані результати мають важливу та потенційно корисну практичну перспективу застосування. А саме, ефективне епідеміологічне інформування має враховувати дискурсивні особливості семантики карантину для певної етнічної групи людей.

**Ключові слова:** карантин, ковід 19, коронавірус, дискурс, лінгвістична семантика, охорона здоров'я.

### **Шимко Віталій Артурович**

доктор психологических наук, директор центра, Аналитический Центр

"Пространство", Одесса, Украина

e-mail: shymkovitalii@gmail.com

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4937-6976>

### **Бабаджанова Анжела Нуриевна**

кандидат психологических наук, директор по персоналу группы компаний

«Голден Тайл», Киев, Украина

e-mail: babadjanova.a@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-6342>

# ДИСКУРС-АНАЛИЗ ПРЕДСТАВЛЕНИЙ УКРАИНЦЕВ О КАРАНТИНЕ: КРАТКИЙ ОТЧЕТ

## *Аннотация*

**Цель.** Исследование направлено на выяснение лингвистической семантики понятия карантин и особенностей его восприятия украинцами.

**Методы.** Дискурсивный анализ письменных определений карантина, полученных от 104 русскоязычных этнических украинцев (47,1% женщин, средний возраст - 41,5). Выявленные дискурсы классифицированы, количественно определены и обработаны с помощью метода бинарной логистической регрессии.

**Результаты.** Карантин, связанный с Covid-19, представлен в языковом сознании русскоязычных украинцев дискурсивным полем, которое включает, по меньшей мере, семь распознаваемых, семантически автономных и взаимосвязанных дискурсов: “Ограничение контактов”; “Санитария и гигиена”; “Изоляция больных”; “Распространение вируса”; “Изменения образа жизни”; “Формально-бюрократическое реагирование”; “Сохранение здоровья”. Согласно результатам исследования, перечисленные дискурсы находятся в специфическом взаимодействии друг с другом и с некоторыми недискурсивными факторами, что формирует дискурсивную формацию понятия карантин.

**Выводы.** Установлено, что актуализация одних дискурсов сопровождается деактивацией других, что обуславливает односторонность и тенденциозность восприятия респондентами карантина. Полученные результаты имеют важную и потенциально полезную практическую перспективу применения. В частности, эффективное эпидемиологическое информирование предполагает необходимость учета дискурсивных особенностей семантики карантина для определенной этнической группы людей.

*Ключевые слова:* карантин, ковид 19 коронавирус, дискурс, лингвистическая семантика, здравоохранение.

**Shymko Vitalii**

Dr. Sc. Psychology, Chief Science Officer, Think Tank Prostranstvo, Odessa, Ukraine

e-mail: shymkovitalii@gmail.com

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4937-6976>

**Babadzhanova Anzhela**

Ph.D. in Psychology, “Golden Tile”, Group of Companies, HR DIRECTOR, Ukraine

e-mail: babadjanova.a@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-6342>

**DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE QUARANTINE IDEATIONS OF  
UKRAINIANS: A BRIEF REPORT**

*Abstract*

***Purpose of the study.** Research aims at clarification of linguistic semantics of quarantine concept and how it perceived by Ukrainians.*

***Design and Methods.** Discourse analysis of written quarantine definitions provided by the 104 russian-speaking ethnic Ukrainians (47.1% of women; average age – 41.5). Discovered discourses were classified, quantified and processed with binary logistic regression method.*

***Results.** Covid-19 related quarantine is represented in the linguistic consciousness of russian-speaking Ukrainians by a discursive field, which includes at least seven recognizable, semantically autonomous and interconnected discourses: “Contact restriction”; “Sanitation and hygiene”; “Isolation of infected”; “Virus dissemination”;*

*“Lifestyle changes”; “Bureaucratic response”; “Health preservation”. According to the research results, the listed discourses have been specifically interacting with each other and with some non-discursive factors, which creates the discursive formation of the quarantine concept.*

**Implications.** *Established that the actualization of some discourses is accompanied by the deactivation of specific others, what makes quarantine perception one-sided and biased. The results obtained have an important and potentially useful practical application perspective. Thus, effective epidemiological informing should consider discursive features of quarantine semantics for particular ethnic group of people.*

**Keywords:** *quarantine, Covid-19, coronavirus, discourse, linguistic semantics, public health.*

**Problem statement.** Efficient implementation of quarantine involves behavioral, organizational, informational, value and other factors synchronization of the actions by millions of people. One of the formal quarantine definitions states it is 'a restriction on the movement of people and goods which is intended to prevent the spread of disease or pests' (Quarantine, 2020). Obviously, human beings are barely guided by formal definitions, but rather their own ideas on the matter. To implement the mentioned synchronization, it is necessary to clarify semantic features of quarantine concept and how it perceived by specific individuals and groups of people.

**Recent research analysis** proves obvious scarcity and understandable sparsity of such studies for the Ukraine population (Haletska et al., 2020, Rutynskyi & Kushniruk, 2020). Much more attention has been paid to this issue in foreign studies (Brooks et.al, 2020; Khan et.al, 2020; Liu et.al, 2020; Muscogiuri et.al, 2020; Nussbaumer-Streit et.al, 2020; Parmet et.al, 2020; Piguillem et.al, 2020; Webster et.al, 2020).

**Purpose of the article.** Research aims at clarification of linguistic semantics of quarantine concept and how it perceived by individuals from the particular ethnic group, i.e. Ukrainian nationality.

**Results and discussions.** The corresponding research was conducted by us on a sample of Russian-speaking Ukrainians. The sample includes 104 participants (all of them with higher education; aged 21 to 62 years; 47.1% of women) from several regions of Ukraine: Kyiv, Dnipro, Kharkiv, Odessa, Lviv, Rivne, Mukachevo. The study was conducted in the second half of May 2020, which means that all respondents spent more than 60 days under national quarantine conditions, started in Ukraine on March 11, 2020. Most of the respondents worked during the quarantine period, visiting offices and other places of professional activity. 13.5% - were on short-term of self-isolations (from 1 to 15 days). One respondent self-isolated himself for 50, and two – for 56 days. According to the participants' self-reports, no one in the indicated period had been officially diagnosed with any diseases and had not experienced any sickness symptoms at the time of the study. 6.7% of respondents said that among their personal environment have been some acquaintances (family members, close friends, work colleagues, etc.) who got sick on coronavirus during quarantine (from 1 to 7 people).

Participants had been asked to set out their own understanding of quarantine, i.e. formulate an appropriate definition in written. Respondents also assessed how much their psychological well-being and everyday life routine had been changed during quarantine and shared some socio-demographic parameters in anonymous questionnaire 'My Quarantine', which along with statistical analysis results are publicly available at Harvard Dataverse (Shymko & Babadzhanova, 2020). The respondents' quarantine definitions were classified and quantified based on such a linguistic category as a discourse (Fairclough, 1995, Foucault, 1972). Herewith the practical side of discourses identification in the texts studied was realized through recognizing stable semantic autonomies generated by dispersions of verbal meanings (Shymko, 2018).

This classification work was carried out by the experts (four scientists, practical researchers with more than 20 years of professional background in the field of applied psycholinguistics). At the first step, each expert independently analyzed every text and formed the initial classification of the identified discourses. Then these discourses were compiled together and in such a way a general list of 23 discourses was created. At the second step, the experts had discussed the general list, clarified the semantics of previously derived discourses and through terminological unification the list was reduced to nine positions. On the third step the hierarchical cluster analysis had been applied, the results of which substantiated the expediency of combining some of the discourses, that ultimately allowed us to distinguish seven discourses in the respective discursive field (Table 1).

*Table 1*

**Discursive field of quarantine concept**

Discourse title	Semantic content of discourses derived by experts
1. Contact restriction	Restriction/control of contacts, meetings and movements as contacts motivators, its amplifiers and intensifiers. Aspect of forced passivity.
2. Sanitation and hygiene	Sanitary and hygiene products and their use, preventive measures. Quarantine behavior (awareness, caution, discipline), including social distancing, remote work and self-isolation. The internality aspect. Activity.
3. Isolation of infected	Isolation of infected and sick people, as well as those who have been in contact with them (ones suspected of being infected). Segregation aspect.
4. Virus dissemination	Prevention (restriction, control) of the spread of the virus (disease). Socio-geographical aspect.

	Reducing the number of infected people and/or patients.
5. Lifestyle changes	Change in the habitual (everyday) way of life of people and society overall (work, home life, entertainment, etc.). Not specified limitations and restrictions of life activity. Discomfort and frustration, as indicators of a reaction to a violation of the regular lifestyle.
6. Bureaucratic response	The introduction of official standards and regulations by the authorities. Socio-legal and medical-infrastructure aspects of state (societal) regulation. Epidemic statistics and other studies. Organization of public awareness (alert system).
7. Health preservation	Isolation of healthy people. Preservation, maintenance and promotion of health. Treatment of patients, contribution to their recovery. Medicines and drugs in the aspect of the means of recovery/maintaining health. Restriction of human rights and freedoms in connection with quarantine. The repressive aspect with “justifying” rationalization (for a good cause).

For the purpose of discourses quantification, a binary nominal scale was used in the dataset (1 – there is discourse; 0 – no discourse), regardless of the amount of corresponding text units (words) and compositional linguistic features of the discourse’s textual manifestations. Statistically significant results of binary logistic regression are presented in Table 2. Note that in addition to the traditional criteria for assessing regression models fitness, the Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit Test was also used (in all cases we found out  $p > .050$ , i.e., the hypothesis of acceptable levels of models’ fitness were accepted). As we can see the inter-discourse relationships have been mostly



negative ( $Exp(B) < 1$ ), i.e. the actualization of one discourse is accompanied by a statistically significant decrease in the probability of another (others) appearances in the text, which in practice means the factual exclusion of these discourses from the quarantine concept (Table 2). This feature determines the respective tendentiousness (biasing) of the quarantine concept semantics.

At the same time “*Number of discourses*” appeared to be a positive predictor ( $Exp(B) > 1$ ) for the most discourses barring “*Isolation of infected*” and “*Health preservation*”. In our opinion such statistical features suggest that the variables reliably dependent on the “*Number of discourses*” are associatively related between themselves. And that lead to an increase in the probability of their emergence as the pithiness of definitions grow. We suggest that these discourses form a stable semantic core of the quarantine concept in the linguistic consciousness of respondents.

Table 2

**Binary logistic regression (dependent variables – discourses)**

Dependent variables (discourses)		Predictors and model parameters						
		Contact restriction	Sanitation and hygiene	Isolation of infected	Virus dissemination	Lifestyle changes	Bureaucratic response	Health preservation
Contact restriction	Odds ratio <i>Exp(B)</i> and <i>p</i> -value		<b>.062</b> (.037)				<b>.001</b> (.002)	
Sanitation and hygiene					<b>.001</b> (.000)			
Isolation of infected					<b>.066</b> (.005)		<b>.013</b> (.006)	
Virus dissemination		<b>.052</b> (.006)	<b>.003</b> (.001)			<b>.028</b> (.002)	<b>.032</b> (.008)	

Lifestyle changes								
Bureaucratic response		<b>.002</b> (.001)						
Health preservation		<b>.022</b> (.010)			<b>.064</b> (.003)	<b>.029</b> (.012)	<b>.007</b> (.003)	
Number of discourses		<b>98.116</b> (.000)	<b>24.942</b> (.000)		<b>22.276</b> (.000)	<b>9.233</b> (.012)	<b>95.670</b> (.000)	
Changes in everyday life		<b>5.972</b> (.006)		<b>.404</b> (.049)				
Self-isolation (days)								<b>1.066</b> (.050)
(*) Model coefficient, $\chi^2$ (sig. <i>p</i> )	50.702 (.000)	38.625 (.000)	4.386 (.036)	51.613 (.000)	40.662 (.000)	53.023 (.000)	6.550 (.010)	
(**) Model Summary (Nagelkerke R Square)	.648	.599	.078	.603	.564	.686	.109	
(***) Predictive value (overall % correct)	86.0	90.7	80.2	82.6	86.7	88.4	79.1	

The dependent variable “*Isolation of infected*” connected with the non-discursive predictor “*Changes in everyday life*” (see Table 2), the negativity of which is conditional. So, this parameter has an ordinal measuring scale that displays the degree of changes in everyday life routine, according to the respondents' ratings: from 1 - no changes to 4 - dramatic changes (Shymko & Babadzhanova, 2020: HO7EWG). Thus, the probability of the “*Isolation of infected*” discourse emergence in the quarantine definition is the higher, the less changes in the daily life of respondents have been and vice versa. This feature makes us suggest the play of some egocentric attitude of the respective respondents, manifested by the principle: ‘quarantine is for infected ones’. An indirect confirmation of the indicated egocentrism of this category of respondents might be found as well in the following observation. The discourse “*Isolation of infected*”, in turn, acts as a negative

predictor in relation to the discourses “*Virus dissemination*” and “*Bureaucratic response*” (see Table 2). That is, respondents who had not been experiencing changes in everyday life routine and discussing isolation of infected ones are not inclined to actualize any other collective aspects of the quarantine problem. It is noteworthy that the non-discursive criterion “*Changes in everyday life*” also acts as a positive predictor for the discourse “*Contact restriction*”, increasing its probability together with the two already mentioned negative predictors and another negative one – “*Health preservation*” (see Table 2). At the same time, the last parameter as a dependent variable is positively predicted by independent non-discursive variable – “*Self-isolation (days)*”. That is, quarantine concept has most likely been defined in the context of maintaining and promoting health by those respondents who have got some experience of being on self-isolation.

Set of stated features endue the discursive field with a specific organization, which allows to consider the field as a discursive formation. Note that there have been two pairs of discourses with two-way connections: “*Virus dissemination*” and “*Sanitation and hygiene*”, as well as “*Bureaucratic response*” and “*Contact restriction*”. The bilateral nature of the negative connection, in our opinion, indicates of accented opposition-like relations between the respective discourses. On the other hand, returning to the identified features of the “*Number of discourse*” predictor, one cannot help but assume the existence of an association-like connection.

This, at first glance, creates a contradiction – negatively connected discourses are simultaneously related associatively, i.e. in positive way. This paradox can be resolved by a systemic distinction of layers (semantic spaces), where the indicated negativity and positivity have taken place. The “horizontal” layer is represented by the functional interaction of discourses as structural components of the system. Note that at this level, the system also includes non-discursive factors. The “vertical” layer is formed through the meaning contribution by each discourse to the semantics of the quarantine concept as a supersystem. Thus, horizontal inter-discourse negative relations do not prevent the

formation of positive connections — vertically integrated associations that are formed indirectly through the category of the supersystem (quarantine).

**Conclusions.** Covid-19 related quarantine is represented in the linguistic consciousness of russian-speaking Ukrainians by a discursive field, which includes at least seven recognizable, semantically autonomous and interconnected discourses. Established that the actualization of some discourses is accompanied by the deactivation of specific others, what makes quarantine perception one-sided and biased.

We hope that the proposed view on quarantine might have a potentially useful applicability. For example, when conducting mass alerts of citizens, organizing educational communication of health authorities with the local population, introducing a quarantine regime at enterprises and institutions, etc., it is important to consider that the rhetoric about controlling of the virus spreading automatically deactivates the topic of sanitary and hygienic measures. Obviously, discursive semantics is associated with cognitive focus, which, in turn, affects the direction and consequences of proper behavior. Therefore, considering the structural and semantic features of the quarantine discursive formation under above circumstances could help increase the productivity and effectiveness of informational anti-epidemiological policies.

We consider the prospects for further studies of the quarantine concept with, firstly, an increasing in the empirical sample, both in quantitative and linguistic-cultural relations and providing the possibility of comparative cross-ethnic research of the actual subject matter. Secondly, a deeper study of the influence on the quarantine concept semantics by the corresponding category of non-discursive factors, including the differential psychological characteristics of linguistic consciousness subjects.

## References

1. Brooks, S.K., Webster R.K., Smith L.E., Woodland L., Wessely S., Greenberg N., Rubin G.J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence, *The Lancet*, Volume 395, Issue 10227, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley.
3. Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.
4. Haletska, I. et al. (2020). quarantine april in ukraine: thoughts, experiences, behaviour faced with the threat of COVID-19. *PSYCHOLOGICAL JOURNAL*, 6(5), 18-36. <https://doi.org/10.31108/1.2020.6.5.2>
5. Khan, S. et al. (2020). Novel coronavirus, poor quarantine, and the risk of pandemic *Journal of Hospital Infection*, Volume 104, Issue 4, 449 – 450 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.02.002>
6. Liu, Jia Jia et al. (2020). Mental health considerations for children quarantined because of COVID-19. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, Volume 4, Issue 5, 347 – 349 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(20\)30096-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30096-1)
7. Muscogiuri, G., Barrea, L., Savastano, S. *et al.* Nutritional recommendations for CoVID-19 quarantine. *Eur J Clin Nutr* **74**, 850–851 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41430-020-0635-2>
8. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Mayr V, Dobrescu AI, Chapman A, Persad E, Klerings I, Wagner G, Siebert U, Ledinger D, Zachariah C, Gartlehner G. (2020). Quarantine alone or in combination with other public health measures to control

COVID-19: a rapid review. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2020, Issue 9 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013574.pub2>

9. Parmet, W.E. & Sinha, M.S. (2020). Covid-19 — The Law and Limits of Quarantine. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(15). <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2004211>

10. Piguillem, Facundo and SHI, LIYAN, Optimal Covid-19 Quarantine and Testing Policies (April 2020). CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP14613, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3594243>

11. Rutynskiy, M. and Kushniruk, H. (2020). The impact of quarantine due to COVID-19 pandemic on the tourism industry in Lviv (Ukraine). *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 18(2), 194-205. doi:10.21511/ppm.18(2).2020.17

12. Shymko, V. (2018). In Pursuit of the Functional Definition of a Mind: The Pivotal Role of a Discourse. *PSYCHOLINGUISTICS*, 24(1), 403-424. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-403-424>

13. Shymko, V. & Babadzhanova, A. (2020). Study of the COVID-19 related quarantine notion as the language consciousness category on the sample of russian speaking Ukrainians. *Harvard Dataverse*. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/Y2YGH7>

14. Quarantine. (2020, July 13). Retrieved July 14, 2020, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quarantine>

15. Webster, R.K., Brooks, S.K., Smith, L.E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Rubin, G.J. (2020)/ How to improve adherence with quarantine: rapid review of the evidence, *Public Health*, Volume 182, Pages 163-169, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.03.007>